

standing back too far from...I will get this down right sooner or later. There is a great temptation for those individuals when they see that they have increased valuation, that they know that they are going to decrease their mill levy to operate their systems, there is a great temptation, I know because I have been there, to slip a few extra programs in so that the overall...you can still increase spending and decrease the mill valuation. There tends to be a taking advantage at this time. What this bill does, as I understand, particularly with the committee amendments, there aren't a lot of teeth in it, frankly. There is no lid provision. There are no penalty provisions. It is merely we, in the Legislature, saying we don't want you local subdivisions using this as an example to do increased spending. The intent of the bill I think is an excellent one. It does not interfere with the local control. I guess what we are saying is, school board, if you want to put that new program in now, city council, if you want to pave that extra street, you still have the right to go ahead and do it but, please, don't take advantage of this state mandated valuation to do that. I think what we have here is basically a good statement of intent and I would urge you to support it.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Remmers, please.

SENATOR REMMERS: (Mike off) ...on the bill.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Harris, did you want to speak about the amendments?

SENATOR HARRIS: Wanted to ask a question of Senator Johnson if he is available.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Okay, would you respond please.

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: Yes, sir, Senator Harris.

SENATOR HARRIS: What happens in the case of a revision downward as a result of the deflation in agricultural areas and the villages in these agricultural areas?

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: The amendment nor the bill, well, the amendment doesn't deal with downward revaluations. It deals with increases. I guess the problem of sort of property tax bracket creep has been an inflationary problem and not a